UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/902,420	07/10/2001	Stephen C. Hilla	112025-0476	7670

24267 7590 08/31/2005

CESARI AND MCKENNA, LLP
88 BLACK FALCON AVENUE
BOSTON, MA 02210

EXAMINER	
VO, LILIAN	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2195	

DATE MAILED: 08/31/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No. 09/902,420	Applicant(s) HILLA ET AL.	
	Examiner Lilian Vo	Art Unit 2195	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 12 August 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
   a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
   b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

   Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
   (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
   (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
   (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
   (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

   NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).
4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
   The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
   Claim(s) allowed: *None*.
   Claim(s) objected to: *None*.
   Claim(s) rejected: *1 - 20*.
   Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☐ Other: _____.

MENG-AL T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Lilian Vo
Examiner
Art Unit: 2195

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The rejection was deemed proper and applicant's arguments are not persuasive for the reasons set forth below.

With respect to applicant's remark that Lin is completely silent regarding applicant's claimed (page 11, 1st paragraph), the examiner disagrees. Lin clearly suggest applicant's claimed in figs. 1 - 3, 5, page 4, paragraphs 37, 38, page 5, paragraphs 45, 47, page 6, paragraph 53, 56 and page 8, paragraphs 65, 67. Since this has been clearly addressed in the rejection, applicant is directed to the previous Office Action for additional details.

Regarding applicant's remark that Lin is completely silent regarding applicant's novel technique for determining processor load based on memory activity (page 11, 2nd paragraph, 3rd sentence), applicant is arguing a feature of the invention not specifically stated in the claim language, which is improper. Claim subject matter, not the specification, is the measure of invention. Limitations in the specification cannot be read into the claims for the purpose of avoiding the prior art. In re Self, 213 USPQ 1,5 (CCPA 1982); In re Priest, 199 USPQ 11,15 (CCPA 1978).

With respect to applicant's argument that the reference does not teach the feature of recognizes and tracks memory cycles associated with the at least one memory block (page 11, last paragraph - page 12, 1st paragraph, page 13, 2nd paragraph, page 13, last paragraph - page 14, 1st paragraph), the examiner disagrees. Lin monitors the number of tasks assigned to each webserver according to the availability of the webserver (page 5, paragraph 47). Lin tracks the session occurring with the user. Any computing and/or session that occur within the webserver require the use of the resource, which also includes the memory usage as well. The step of determining whether the webserver is available suggests that the server resource is taking into the consideration. If the tracking of the server resource, which also includes the memory usage, has not been done, how would the system able to determine the server is available or able to take on any additional tasks. Therefore, Lin's disclosure indirectly if not directly suggests the step of recognizing and tracking memory cycles associated with the at least one memory block.

In response to applicant's argument that the reference is about load balancer monitors the data flow rate for each individual webserver for the purpose of load balancing and the state server monitors whether the webserver is in service during session for the purpose of failure recovery (page 11, last paragraph - page 12, 1st paragraph), a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See In re Casey, 370 F.2d 576, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and In re Otto, 312 F.2d 937, 939, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963).